

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Voois <i>et al.</i>	Examiner:	Shingles, Kristie D.
Serial No.:	09/597,704	Group Art Unit:	2441
Filed:	June 16, 2000	Docket No.:	8X8S.249PA
Title:	COMMUNICATIONS CONTROLLER AND METHOD THEREFOR		

---

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY

MAIL STOP Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Customer No. <b>40581</b>
------------------------------

Dear Sir:

This paper is submitted to clarify the Examiner's Interview Summary regarding the telephone discussions initiated by the Examiner involving what Applicant understands to be an informal interview. Applicant's representative had no notification of a formal interview and did not have an opportunity to prepare.

Moreover, the informal discussions should not be characterized as an "Interview" in the record per the requirements of the M.P.E.P. As indicated in M.P.E.P. § 713.05:

The examiner, by making a telephone call, may be able to suggest minor, probably quickly acceptable changes which would result in allowance. If there are *major* questions or suggestions, the call might state them concisely, and suggest a further telephone, electronic mail, or personal interview, at a prearranged later time, giving applicant more time for consideration before discussing the points raised.

In this instance, the Examiner communicated to Applicant and/or suggested changes which did not meet the standards for an interview.

Also, Applicant's representative did not suggest integrating only a portion of claim 2's limitations into the independent claims, but rather Applicant's representative simply highlighted aspects representing (further) lack of correspondence. Applicant further traverses the Examiner's indication that the '108 reference discloses limitations in claim 2, and that the introduction of new rejections in the context of an Interview summary is also improper.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that this Response is clarifying in a manner that is consistent with the rules and requirements set forth in the C.F.R. and M.P.E.P.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC  
1150 Northland Drive, Suite 100  
St. Paul, MN 55120  
651/259-2300

Dated: December 2, 2009

By: 

Eric J. Curtin

Reg. No. 47,511